

Remarks

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, the Applicant has not amended, cancelled, or added any claims. Of the pending claims, claims 1, 12, and 23-24 are the only independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action mailed September 12, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. published patent publication no. 2002/0167946 issued to Gallant ("Gallant"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and believes that the claims are patentable over Gallant.

1. The Claimed Invention

The claimed invention is directed to restricting telephone calls that originate from a facility. As set forth in representative independent claim 1, a system for restricting telephone calls that originate from a facility includes a facility resident telephone(s), a switching office ("SO"), and a destination telephone. The facility resident telephone is configured to originate and present a call signal. The facility resident telephone, the SO, and the destination telephone are electrically serially coupled such that a call signal originating at the facility resident telephone is routed to the destination telephone via the SO. The SO disables a custom calling feature(s) corresponding to the call signal upon determining the call signal as originating from the facility resident telephone. Claims 2-3, which depend from independent claim 1, respectively recite the custom calling feature as being either three-way calling or call forwarding.

2. Gallant

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner posited that Gallant teaches a system for restricting telephone calls from a facility having a facility phone (citing paragraph 0011), a SO (citing Fig. 1), a destination phone (citing Fig. 1), the call is disabled (citing the Abstract; and Figs. 3A and 3B), the call is disabled based on the facility (citing paragraphs 0058, 0089-0092, 0096-0097, 0108; and Figs. 6-8). The Examiner noted that although Gallant does not explicitly say serial the Examiner believes that it is inherent. Alternatively, the Examiner posited that such would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as connecting devices in serial or parallel is well-known.

With respect to dependent claim 2 (three-way calling), the Examiner noted that although Gallant does not mention three-way calling it would have been obvious to have included three-way calling as such would only entail including or substituting one well-known feature for another. With respect to dependent claim 3 (call forwarding), the Examiner noted the abstract of Gallant for teaching this feature.

3. The Claimed Invention Compared to Gallant

The claimed invention generally differs from Gallant in that in the claimed invention a custom calling feature corresponding to a call signal is disabled whereas in Gallant, as posited by the Examiner, the call signal itself is disabled.

More particularly, in the claimed invention, a custom calling feature corresponding to a call signal originating from a facility resident telephone is disabled upon determining that the call signal originated from the facility resident telephone. The call signal itself is routed from the facility resident telephone to a destination telephone. However, a custom calling feature corresponding to the call signal routed between the facility resident telephone and the destination telephone is disabled.

In contrast to disabling a custom calling feature corresponding to a telephone call originating from a facility resident telephone as claimed, Gallant teaches, as posited by the Examiner, disabling the telephone call itself (the Examiner noting “that the call is disabled” and citing the Abstract, Figs. 3A and 3B, paragraphs 0058, 0089-0092, 0096-0097, 0108, and Figs. 6-8 of Gallant for this proposition).

The Applicant believes that the general relevance of Gallant is that “user profile information associated with a party controls the invocation of features for the party and controls the screening of redirect contacts resulting from feature invocation” (Abstract of Gallant). That is, each user has a user profile which includes profile fields that control different aspects of service processing. (See paragraphs 0089-0092 and 0096-0097 of Gallant.)

For example, the value in field 616 for each record may affect originating call screening or “OCS”, meaning the permissions for the user to originate calls. The value in field 617 may affect terminating call screening or “TCS”, meaning calls that the user may accept from others. In particular, the value in field 618 may control feature-associated call screening or simply “feature blocking” or “FBL”. (Paragraph 0092 of Gallant)

In operation, a routing request is interpreted to identify the origin of the call and the intended destination party for the call. (Paragraph 0099 of Gallant.) In general, “the information available from such [user] profiles describes outbound calling permissions for the originating party and acceptable inbound calls for the terminating party” and, in the context of a particular routing request, “both of these factors affect whether or not the session request is permissible.” (Paragraph 0100 of Gallant.) See also paragraph 0058 of Gallant, “The proxy server may then relay a routing request to the location server for such purposes as verifying the privileges of the first user to reach the second user, finding one or more locations for the second user and performing any call handing features provisioned for the first or second users.”

Accordingly, Gallant teaches users having user profiles which generally define whether a first user is able to call a second user. In general, a first user is able to call a second

user if the first user has permission to originate the call to the second user (i.e., originating call permission) and if the second user has permission to receive a call from the first user (i.e., terminating call permission). Thus, if a first user is not able to call a second user, then the call itself from the first user to the second user is disabled or, more accurately, prevented from taking place at all. Conversely, if the first user is able to call the second user, then the call itself from the first user to the second user is enabled.

As such, the claimed invention differs from Gallant in that in the claimed invention a custom calling feature corresponding to a call signal is disabled upon determining the call signal as originating from a facility resident telephone whereas in Gallant a call signal from a first user to a second user is disabled if either the first user does not have permission to call the second user or if the second user does not have permission to receive a call from the first user.

Therefore, the Applicant believes that independent claims 1, 12, and 23-24 are patentable over Gallant. Claims 2-11 and 13-22 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 12 and include the limitations therein. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In summary, claims 1-24 meet the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK R. BUNKER

By

James N. Kallis
Reg. No. 41,102
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 29, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351